

$\mathcal{QT}$ -Symmetry and Weak Pseudo-Hermiticity

Ali Mostafazadeh

Department of Mathematics, Koç University,
34450 Sariyer, Istanbul, Turkey
amostafazadeh@ku.edu.tr

Abstract

For an invertible (bounded) linear operator $\mathcal{Q}$ acting in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, we consider the consequences of the $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry of a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $H : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ where $\mathcal{T}$ is the time-reversal operator. If H is symmetric in the sense that $\mathcal{T}H^\dagger\mathcal{T} = H$, then $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry is equivalent to $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity. But in general this equivalence does not hold. We show this using some specific examples. Among these is a large class of non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians that share the spectral properties of $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians.

PACS number: 03.65.-w

Keywords: Antilinear operator, symmetry, $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry, Pseudo-Hermiticity, periodic potential.

1 Introduction

Among the motivations for the study of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum mechanics is the argument that *$\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry is a more physical condition than Hermiticity because $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry refers to “space-time reflection symmetry” whereas Hermiticity is “a mathematical condition whose physical basis is somewhat remote and obscure” [1].* This statement is based on the assumption that the operators $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ continue to keep their standard meanings, as parity (space)-reflection and time-reversal operators, also in $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum mechanics. But this assumption is not generally true, for unlike $\mathcal{T}$ the parity operator $\mathcal{P}$ loses its connection to physical space once one endows the Hilbert space with an appropriate inner product to reinstate unitarity. This is because for a general $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian, such as $H = p^2 + x^2 + ix^3$, the x -operator is no longer a physical observable, the kets $|x\rangle$ do not correspond to localized states in space, and $\mathcal{P} :=$

$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |x\rangle\langle -x|$ does not mean space-reflection [2, 3].¹ Furthermore, it turns out that one cannot actually avoid using the mathematical operations such as Hermitian conjugation ($A \rightarrow A^\dagger$)² or transposition ($A \rightarrow A^t := \mathcal{T}A^\dagger\mathcal{T}$) in defining the notion of an observable in $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum mechanics [4, 5].

What makes $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry interesting is not its physical appeal but the fact that $\mathcal{PT}$ is an antilinear operator.³ In fact, the spectral properties of $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians [6] that have made them a focus of recent interest follow from this property. In general, if a linear operator H commutes with an antilinear operator Θ , the spectrum of H may be shown to be pseudo-real, i.e., as a subset of complex plane it is symmetric about the real axis. In particular, nonreal eigenvalues of H come in complex-conjugate pairs. If H is a diagonalizable operator with a discrete spectrum the latter condition is necessary and sufficient for the pseudo-Hermiticity of H [7].

In [8], we showed that the spectrum of the Hamiltonian $H = p^2 + z\delta(x)$ is real and that one can apply the methods of pseudo-Hermitian quantum mechanics [2] to identify H with the Hamiltonian of a unitary quantum system provided that the real part of z does not vanish.⁴ This Hamiltonian is manifestly non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric. The purpose of this paper is to offer other classes of non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians that enjoy the same spectral properties.

In the following, we shall use $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ to denote a (separable) Hilbert space and an invertible antilinear operator acting in $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. For $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define $\mathcal{T}$ by [9]

$$(\mathcal{T}\psi)(\vec{x}) := \psi(\vec{x})^*, \quad (1)$$

for all $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^N$, we identify it with complex-conjugation: For all $\vec{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$,

$$\mathcal{T}\vec{z} := \vec{z}^*. \quad (2)$$

2 $\mathcal{QT}$ -Symmetry

Consider a Hamiltonian operator H acting in $\mathcal{H}$ and commuting with an arbitrary invertible antilinear operator Θ . Because $\mathcal{T}$ is also invertible and antilinear, we can express Θ as $\Theta = \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{T}$ where $\mathcal{Q} := \Theta\mathcal{T}$ is an invertible linear operator. This suggests the investigation of $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians H ,

$$[H, \mathcal{QT}] = 0, \quad (3)$$

¹The space reflection operator is given by $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx |\xi^{(x)}\rangle\langle \xi^{(-x)}|$ where $|\xi^{(x)}\rangle$ denote the (localized) eigenkets of the pseudo-Hermitian position operator X , [2].

²The adjoint $A^\dagger$ of an operator $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is defined by the condition $\langle \psi | A\phi \rangle = \langle A^\dagger \psi | \phi \rangle$ where $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is the defining inner product of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

³This means that $\mathcal{PT}(a_1\psi_1 + a_2\psi_2) = a_1^*\mathcal{PT}\psi_1 + a_2^*\mathcal{PT}\psi_2$, where a_1, a_2 are complex numbers and ψ_1, ψ_2 are state vectors.

⁴Otherwise H has a spectral singularity and it cannot define a unitary time-evolution regardless of the choice of the inner product.

where $\mathcal{Q}$ is an invertible linear operator. Note that $\mathcal{Q}$ need not be a Hermitian operator or an involution, i.e., in general $\mathcal{Q}^\dagger \neq \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^2 \neq 1$.

We can easily rewrite (3) in the form

$$\mathcal{T}H\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{Q}^{-1}H\mathcal{Q}, \quad (4)$$

This is similar to the condition that H is $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weakly-pseudo-Hermitian [12, 13, 14, 15]:

$$H^\dagger = \mathcal{Q}^{-1}H\mathcal{Q}. \quad (5)$$

In fact, (4) and (5) coincide if and only if

$$\mathcal{T}H^\dagger\mathcal{T} = H. \quad (6)$$

The left-hand side of this relation is the usual “transpose” of H that we denote by H^t . Therefore, $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry is equivalent to $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity if and only if $H^t = H$, i.e., H is symmetric.⁵ For example, let $\vec{a}$ and v be respectively complex vector and scalar potentials, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then the Hamiltonian⁶

$$H = \frac{[\vec{p} - \vec{a}(\vec{x})]^2}{2m} + v(\vec{x}), \quad (7)$$

is symmetric if and only if $\vec{a} = \vec{0}$. Supposing that $\vec{a}$ and v are analytic functions, the $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry of (7), i.e., (4) is equivalent to

$$\frac{[\vec{p} + \vec{a}(\vec{x})^*]^2}{2m} + v(\vec{x})^* = \frac{[\vec{p}_\mathcal{Q} - \vec{a}(\vec{x}_\mathcal{Q})]^2}{2m} + v(\vec{x}_\mathcal{Q}), \quad (8)$$

where for any linear operator $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, we have $L_\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Q}^{-1}L\mathcal{Q}$. Similarly the $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity of H , i.e., (5) means

$$\frac{[\vec{p} - \vec{a}(\vec{x})^*]^2}{2m} + v(\vec{x})^* = \frac{[\vec{p}_\mathcal{Q} - \vec{a}(\vec{x}_\mathcal{Q})]^2}{2m} + v(\vec{x}_\mathcal{Q}), \quad (9)$$

As seen from (8) and (9), there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonians of the standard form (7), namely that given such a $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian H with vector and scalar potentials v and a , there is a $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonian H' with vector and scalar potentials $v' = v$ and $a' = ia$. Note however that H and H' are not generally isospectral.

⁵It is a common practice to identify operators with matrices and define the transpose of an operator H as the operator whose matrix representation is the transpose of the matrix representation of H . Because one must use a basis to determine the matrix representation, unlike $H^t := \mathcal{T}H^\dagger\mathcal{T}$, this definition of transpose is basis-dependent. Note however that H^t agrees with this definition if one uses the position basis $\{|\vec{x}\rangle\}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the standard basis in $\mathbb{C}^N$.

⁶Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians of this form have been used in modelling localization effects in condensed matter physics [16].

3 A Class of Matrix Models

Consider two-level matrix models defined on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$ endowed with the Euclidean inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$. In the following we explore the $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity of a general Hamiltonian $H = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{d} \end{pmatrix}$ for $\mathcal{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{q} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{C}$.

3.1 $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Two-Level Systems

Imposing the condition that H is $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric (i.e., Eq. (4) holds) restricts $\mathbf{q}$ to real and imaginary values, and leads to the following forms for the Hamiltonian.

- For real $\mathbf{q}$:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & a \end{pmatrix}, \quad a, c \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (10)$$

In this case H is a non-diagonalizable operator with a real spectrum consisting of a .

- For imaginary $\mathbf{q}$ ($\mathbf{q} = iq$ with $q \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$):

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} a - \frac{i}{2}bq & b \\ c + \frac{i}{2}(a-d)q & d + \frac{i}{2}bq \end{pmatrix}, \quad a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (11)$$

In this case the eigenvalues of H are given by $E_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}[a + d \pm \sqrt{(a-d)^2 - b(bq^2 - 4c)}]$. Therefore, for $(a-d)^2 \geq b(bq^2 - 4c)$, H is a diagonalizable operator with a real spectrum; and for $(a-d)^2 < b(bq^2 - 4c)$, H is diagonalizable but its spectrum consists of a pair of (complex-conjugate) non-real eigenvalues. Furthermore, the degeneracy condition: $(a-d)^2 = b(bq^2 - 4c)$ marks an exceptional spectral point [10, 11] where H becomes non-diagonalizable. In fact, for $a = d$ and $b = 0$ this condition is satisfied and H takes the form (10). Therefore, (11) gives the general form of $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians provided that $q \in \mathbb{R}$.

3.2 $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weakly-pseudo-Hermitian Two-Level Systems

Demanding that H is $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weakly-pseudo-Hermitian does not pose any restriction on the value of $\mathbf{q}$. It yields the following forms for the Hamiltonian.

- For $\mathbf{q} = 0$:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} a & b_1 + ib_2 \\ b_1 - ib_2 & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad a, b_1, b_2, d \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (12)$$

In this case $\mathcal{Q}$ is the identity operator and $H = H^{\dagger}$. Therefore, H is a diagonalizable operator with a real spectrum.

- For $\mathbf{q} \neq 0$:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 + ia_2 & -\frac{2ia_2}{\mathbf{q}} \\ \frac{2ia_2}{\mathbf{q}^*} & a_1 - ia_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}. \quad (13)$$

In this case the eigenvalues of H are given by $E_{\pm} = a_1 \pm |a_2||\mathbf{q}|^{-1}\sqrt{4 - |\mathbf{q}|^2}$. Therefore, for $|\mathbf{q}| < 2$, H is a diagonalizable operator with a real spectrum; and for $|\mathbf{q}| > 2$, H is diagonalizable but its spectrum consists of a pair of (complex-conjugate) non-real eigenvalues. Again the degenerate case: $|\mathbf{q}| = 2$ corresponds to an exceptional point where H becomes non-diagonalizable.

Comparing (11) with (12) and (13) we see that $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity are totally different conditions on a general non-symmetric Hamiltonian.⁷ For a symmetric Hamiltonian, we can easily show using (12) and (13) that $\mathbf{q}$ is either real or imaginary and that H takes the form (11). The converse is also true, i.e., any symmetric Hamiltonian of the form (11) is either real (and hence Hermitian) or has the form (13). In summary, $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity coincide if and only if the Hamiltonian is a symmetric matrix.

4 Unitary $\mathcal{Q}$ and a Class of non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -Symmetric Hamiltonians with a Pseudo-Real Spectrum

If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a unitary operator, the $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity (5) of a Hamiltonian H implies its $\mathcal{Q}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity, i.e., $H^\dagger = \mathcal{Q}^{-1}H\mathcal{Q}$. This together with (5) leads in turn to

$$[H, \mathcal{Q}^2] = 0, \quad (14)$$

i.e., $\mathcal{Q}^2$ is a symmetry generator. In the following we examine some simple unitary choices for $\mathcal{Q}$ and determine the form of the $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermitian and $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric standard Hamiltonians.

Consider a standard non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (7) in one dimension and let

$$\mathcal{Q} = e^{\frac{i\ell p}{\hbar}} \quad (15)$$

for some $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then introducing

$$a_1 := \Re(a), \quad a_2 := \Im(a), \quad v_1 := \Re(v), \quad v_2 := \Im(v),$$

where $\Re$ and $\Im$ stand for the real and imaginary parts of their argument, and using the identities

$$\mathcal{Q}^{-1}p\mathcal{Q} = p, \quad \mathcal{Q}^{-1}x\mathcal{Q} = x - \ell, \quad (16)$$

⁷Note that this is not in conflict with the fact that in view of the spectral theorems of [17, 12, 18] both of these conditions imply pseudo-Hermiticity of the Hamiltonian albeit with respect to a pseudo-metric operator that differs from $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$, [15].

we can express the condition of the $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity of H , namely (9), in the form

$$a_1(x - \ell) = a_1(x), \quad a_2(x - \ell) = -a_2(x), \quad (17)$$

$$v_1(x - \ell) = v_1(x), \quad v_2(x - \ell) = -v_2(x). \quad (18)$$

This means that the real part of the vector and scalar potential are periodic functions with period ℓ while their imaginary parts are antiperiodic with period ℓ . This confirms (14), for H is invariant under the translation, $x \rightarrow x + 2\ell$, generated by $\mathcal{Q}^2$. We can express a_1, v_1 and a_2, v_2 in terms of their Fourier series. These have respectively the following forms

$$\ell\text{-periodic real parts : } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[c_{1n} \cos\left(\frac{2n\pi x}{\ell}\right) + d_{1n} \sin\left(\frac{2n\pi x}{\ell}\right) \right], \quad (19)$$

$$\ell\text{-antiperiodic imaginary parts : } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[c_{2n} \cos\left(\frac{(2n+1)\pi x}{\ell}\right) + d_{2n} \sin\left(\frac{(2n+1)\pi x}{\ell}\right) \right], \quad (20)$$

where c_{kn} and d_{kn} are real constants for all $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

Conversely if the real and imaginary parts of both the vector and scalar potential have respectively the form (19) and (20), the Hamiltonian is $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermitian. In particular its spectrum is pseudo-real; its complex eigenvalues come in complex-conjugate pairs. These Hamiltonians that are generally non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric acquire $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry provided that they are symmetric, i.e., $a_1 = a_2 = 0$. A simple example is

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \lambda_1 \sin(2kx) + i\lambda_2 \cos(5kx),$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k := \ell^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Next, we examine the condition of $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry of H , i.e., (8). In view of (16), this condition is equivalent to (18) and

$$a_1(x - \ell) = -a_1(x), \quad a_2(x - \ell) = a_2(x), \quad (21)$$

which replaces (17). Therefore v has the same form as for the case of a $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonian but a has ℓ -antiperiodic real and ℓ -periodic imaginary parts. In particular, the Fourier series for real and imaginary parts of a have respectively the form (20) and (19).

We again see that general $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians of the standard form (7) are invariant under the translation $x \rightarrow x + 2\ell$. This is indeed to be expected, because in view of $[\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T}] = 0$ we can express (4) in the form

$$H = \mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathcal{T} H \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \quad (22)$$

and use this identity to establish

$$\mathcal{Q}^2 H = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} H \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T} (\mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathcal{T} H \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q}) \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} = H \mathcal{Q}^2.$$

The results obtained in this section admit a direct generalization to higher-dimensional standard Hamiltonians. This involves identifying $\mathcal{Q}$ with a translation operator of the form $e^{\frac{i\vec{\ell}\cdot\vec{p}}{\hbar}}$ for some $\vec{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^3 - \{\vec{0}\}$. It yields $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weakly-pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonians with a pseudo-real spectrum that are invariant under the translation $\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{x} - 2\vec{\ell}$.

An alternative generalization of the results of this section to (two and) three dimensions is to identify $\mathcal{Q}$ with a rotation operator:

$$\mathcal{Q} = e^{\frac{i\varphi\hat{n}\cdot\vec{J}}{\hbar}}, \quad (23)$$

where $\varphi \in (0, 2\pi)$, $\hat{n}$ is a unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\vec{J}$ is the angular momentum operator. Again $[\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{T}] = 0$ and we obtain generally non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric, $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermitian and $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians with a pseudo-real spectrum that are invariant under rotations by an angle 2φ about the axis defined by $\hat{n}$.

Choosing a cylindrical coordinate system whose z -axis is along $\hat{n}$, we can obtain the general form of such standard Hamiltonians.

The $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity of H implies that the real and imaginary parts of the vector and scalar potentials (that we identify with labels 1 and 2 respectively) satisfy

$$\vec{a}_1(\rho, \theta - \varphi, z) = \vec{a}_1(\rho, \theta, z), \quad \vec{a}_2(\rho, \theta - \varphi, z) = -\vec{a}_2(\rho, \theta, z), \quad (24)$$

$$v_1(\rho, \theta - \varphi, z) = v_1(\rho, \theta, z), \quad v_2(\rho, \theta - \varphi, z) = -v_2(\rho, \theta, z), \quad (25)$$

where (ρ, θ, z) stand for cylindrical coordinates. Similarly, the $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry yields (25) and

$$\vec{a}_1(\rho, \theta - \varphi, z) = -\vec{a}_1(\rho, \theta, z), \quad \vec{a}_2(\rho, \theta - \varphi, z) = \vec{a}_2(\rho, \theta, z). \quad (26)$$

Again we can derive the general form of the Fourier series for these potentials. Here we suffice to give the form of the general symmetric Hamiltonian:

$$H = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} [e_n(\rho, z) \cos(2n\omega\theta) + f_n(\rho, z) \sin(2n\omega\theta) + i \{g_n(\rho, z) \cos[(2n+1)\omega\theta] + h_n(\rho, z) \sin[(2n+1)\omega\theta]\}], \quad (27)$$

where e_n , f_n , g_n , and h_n are real-valued functions and $\omega := \varphi^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

5 A $\mathcal{QT}$ -Symmetric and non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -Symmetric Hamiltonian with a Real Spectrum

In the preceding section we examined $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians with a unitary $\mathcal{Q}$. Because $\mathcal{P}$ is also a unitary operator, $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry with unitary $\mathcal{Q}$ may be considered as a less drastic generalization of $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry. In this section we explore a $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric model with a non-unitary $\mathcal{Q}$.

Let a and $a^\dagger$ be the bosonic annihilation and creation operators acting in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and satisfying $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$, and⁸

$$\mathcal{Q} := e^{\mathbf{q}a}. \quad (28)$$

Consider the Hamiltonian operator

$$H = \alpha a^2 + \beta a^{\dagger 2} + \gamma \{a, a^\dagger\} + \mathbf{m}a + \mathbf{n}a^\dagger, \quad (29)$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{C}$, and demand that H be $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric. Inserting (29) in (4) and using (1) and the identity $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}a^\dagger\mathcal{Q} = a^\dagger - \mathbf{q}$, we obtain

$$\alpha^* = \alpha, \quad \beta^* = \beta, \quad \gamma^* = \gamma, \quad \mathbf{m}^* = \mathbf{m} - 2\gamma\mathbf{q}, \quad \mathbf{n}^* = \mathbf{n} - 2\beta\mathbf{q}, \quad \mathbf{n}\mathbf{q} = 0.$$

In particular, because $\mathbf{q} \neq 0$, we have $\mathbf{n} = 0$ which in turn implies $\beta = 0$. Furthermore, assuming that $\gamma \neq 0$, we find that $\mathbf{q}$ must be purely imaginary, $\mathbf{q} = iq$ with $q \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$, and $\Im(\mathbf{m}) = \gamma q$. In view of these observations, H takes the following simple form.

$$H = \alpha a^2 + \gamma \{a, a^\dagger\} + (\mu + i\gamma q)a, \quad (30)$$

where $\mu := \Re(\mathbf{m})$, $\alpha, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\gamma, q \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$.

Recalling that $\mathcal{P}a\mathcal{P} = -a$ and $\mathcal{T}a\mathcal{T} = a$, we see that for $\mu \neq 0$, the $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian (30) is non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric. We also expect that it must have a pseudo-real spectrum. It turns out that actually the spectrum of H can be computed exactly.

To obtain the spectrum of H we use its representation in the basis consisting of the standard normalized eigenvectors $|n\rangle$ of the number operator $a^\dagger a$. Using the following well-known properties of $|n\rangle$, [19],

$$a|n\rangle = \sqrt{n}|n-1\rangle, \quad a^\dagger|n\rangle = \sqrt{n+1}|n+1\rangle,$$

we find for all $m, n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$,

$$H_{mn} := \langle m|H|n\rangle = \gamma(2n+1)\delta_{mn} + (\mu + i\gamma q)\sqrt{n}\delta_{m,n-1} + \alpha\sqrt{n(n-1)}\delta_{m,n-2}.$$

As seen from this relation the matrix (H_{mn}) is upper-triangular with distinct diagonal entries and up to three nonzero terms in each row. This implies that the eigenvalues E_n of (H_{mn}) are identical with its diagonal entries, i.e., $E_n = \gamma(2n+1)$. In particular, H has a discrete, equally spaced, real spectrum that is positive for $\gamma > 0$. In the latter case H is isospectral to a simple harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian with ground state energy γ .

It is not difficult to see that for each $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ the span of $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n\rangle\}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{H}_n$, is an invariant subspace of H . This observation allows for the construction of a complete set of eigenvectors of H and establishes the fact that H is a diagonalizable operator with a discrete real spectrum. Therefore, in view of a theorem proven in [20], it is related to a Hermitian operator via a similarity transformation, i.e., it is quasi-Hermitian [21].

⁸The $\mathcal{Q}$ considered in Section 3 may be viewed as a fermionic analog of (28).

The existence of the invariant subspace $\mathcal{H}_n$ also implies that the eigenvectors $|\psi_n\rangle$ of H corresponding to the eigenvalue E_n belong to $\mathcal{H}_n$, i.e., $|\psi_n\rangle$ is a linear combination of $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |n-1\rangle$ and $|n\rangle$. This in turn allows for a calculation of $|\psi_n\rangle$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_0\rangle &= c_0|0\rangle, & |\psi_1\rangle &= c_1 \left[|0\rangle + \left(\frac{2\gamma}{\mathbf{m}} \right) |1\rangle \right], \\ |\psi_2\rangle &= c_2 \left[|0\rangle + \left(\frac{4\gamma\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{m}^2 + \alpha\gamma} \right) |1\rangle + \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\gamma^2}{\mathbf{m}^2 + \alpha\gamma} \right) |2\rangle \right], \end{aligned}$$

where c_0, c_1, c_2 are arbitrary nonzero normalization constants and $\mathbf{m} = \mu + i\gamma q$.

6 Concluding Remarks

It is often stated that $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry is a special case of pseudo-Hermiticity because $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians are manifestly $\mathcal{P}$ -pseudo-Hermitian. This reasoning is only valid for symmetric Hamiltonians H that satisfy $H^\dagger = \mathcal{T}H\mathcal{T}$. In general to establish the claim that $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry is a special case of pseudo-Hermiticity one needs to make use of the spectral theorems of [17, 12, 18]. Indeed what makes $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians interesting is the pseudo-reality of their spectrum. This is a general property of all Hamiltonians that are weakly pseudo-Hermitian or possess a symmetry that is generated by an invertible antilinear operator. We call the latter $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric.

In this article, we have examined in some detail the similarities and differences between $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity and obtained large classes of symmetric as well as asymmetric non- $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians that share the spectral properties of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians. In particular, we considered the case that $\mathcal{Q}$ is a unitary operator and showed that in this case $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetry and $\mathcal{Q}^{-1}$ -weak-pseudo-Hermiticity imply $\mathcal{Q}^2$ -symmetry of the Hamiltonian. We also explored a concrete example of a $\mathcal{QT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian with a non-unitary $\mathcal{Q}$ that is not $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric. We determined the spectrum of this Hamiltonian, established its diagonalizability, and showed that it is indeed quasi-Hermitian.

References

- [1] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Am. J. Phys. **71**, 1095 (2003).
- [2] A. Mostafazadeh and A. Batal, J. Phys. A **37**, 11645 (2004).
- [3] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A **38**, 6557 (2005).
- [4] A. Mostafazadeh, Preprint: quant-ph/0407070.
- [5] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 119902 (2004).
- [6] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5243 (1998).
- [7] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 3944 (2002).
- [8] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A **39**, 10171 (2006).
- [9] C. J. Isham, *Lectures on Quantum Theory*, Imperial College Press, London, 1995.
- [10] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer, Berlin, 1995.
- [11] W. D. Heiss, J. Phys. A **37**, 2455 (2004).
- [12] L. Solombrino, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 5439 (2002).
- [13] B. Bagchi and C. Quesne, Phys. Lett. A **301**, 173 (2002).
- [14] M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A **353**, 463 (2006).
- [15] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **47**, 092101 (2006).
- [16] N. Hatano, D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 8651 (1997); *ibid* **58**, 8384 (1998).
- [17] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 205 (2002); and 6343 (2002); Erratum: *ibid*, **44**, 943 (2003).
- [18] G. Sclarici and L. Solombrino, J. Math. Phys. **44**, 4450 (2003).
- [19] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics*, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1994.
- [20] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 2814 (2002).
- [21] F. G. Scholtz, H. B. Geyer, and F. J. W. Hahne, Ann. Phys. (NY) **213** 74 (1992).